



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,739	07/17/2003	Roger E. Weiss	15876-46042	1788

7590 11/10/2005
Brian M. Dingman
Mirick, O'Connell, DeMallie & Lougee, LLP
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581-3941

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TRUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2833

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H.A

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/621,739	Applicant(s) WEISS ET AL.	
	Examiner Truc T. T. Nguyen	Art Unit 2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed on 10/14/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The indicated allowability of claims 5 and 12-14 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Wood et al. (US 4,808,112), Niedzwiecki (US 3,613,049) and Stobie (US 5,782,645). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/14/2005 has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claims 7-8 can not be examined because claim 7 is depended on itself. However, the examiner will treat claim 7 is depended on claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The limitation of “conductors of both flex cables are on the surface of the cables” is unclear. The conductors are “exposed conductors” of the cable as defined in claim 1 and therefore it is impossible to be on the surface of the cables.

The “pads” is an impossible features of the cables.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 7-8, 12-14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stobie (US 5,782,645).

Stobie disclose a separable electrical connector, comprising:

at least two multi-conductor cables (32, 42) with exposed conductors (102, 100) and is being as a spaced coaxial conductor (see Figure 4);

anisotropic conductive elastomer (44);

mounting sleeves (80, 82);

mechanical clamp assembly (40, 21, 24, Figure 4).

The limitation of “the mounting sleeves is made by potting....” in claim 14 does not carry a patentable weight. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the

Art Unit: 2833

prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-2, 6, 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niedzwiecki (US 3,613,049) in view of Wood et al. (US 4,808,112).

Niedzwiecki discloses a separable electrical connector, comprising:

at least two flex multi-conductor ribbon cable (14) with exposed spaced coaxial conductors (15);

an electrical connection block (13) in electrical contact with the exposed conductors;

a compression mechanical structure (11, 12, 23a, 23b).

Niedzwiecki substantially disclosed the claimed invention except the electrical connection block is being as an anisotropic conductive elastomer.

Wood et al. teach an anisotropic conductive elastomer (12) in direct contact with conductors (11, 15).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the connection block in the Niedzwiecki's connector by the

Art Unit: 2833

anisotropic conductive elastomer, as taught by Wood et al. for providing a low profile connector and reliable electrical connection.

8. Claims 3-4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niedzwiecki (US 3,613,049) and Wood et al. (US 4,808,112) as applied in claim 1 above, and further in view of Buck et al. (US 6,786,762).

In the modified connector, Niedzwiecki and Wood substantially disclosed the claimed invention except for the exposed conductor being directly connected to a paddle board/circuit board.

Buck et al. teach a board (50) in directly connection with conductors (40) of cable (34).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a board into the modified connector of Niedzwiecki, as taught by Buck et al. for providing a precise electrical connection.

Providing a board at each end of the flex cable is just a mere duplication design. It has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

9. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buck et al. (US 6,786,762) in view of Wood et al. (US 4,808,112).

Buck et al. disclose a separable electrical connector, comprising:

a multi-conductor ribbon cable (134) with exposed conductors (140, 141);

a paddle board (150) having conductors (160);

a printed circuit board (22).

Buck et al. substantially disclosed the claimed invention except for an anisotropic conductive elastomer.

Wood et al. teach an anisotropic conductive elastomer (12) in direct contact with conductors (11, 15).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the connection block in the Niedzwiecki's connector by the anisotropic conductive elastomer, as taught by Wood et al. for providing a reliable electrical connection.

10. Claims 17 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buck et al. (US 6,786,762) and Wood et al. (US 4,808,112) as applied in claim 15 above, and further in view of Niedzwiecki (US 3,613,049).

In the modified connector, Buck et al. and Wood et al. substantially disclosed the claimed invention except for the second electrical device is being as a second ribbon cable.

Niedzwiecki teach two ribbon cables (14) being electrically connected to each other.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the circuit board in the Buck's connector by the ribbon cable, as taught by Niedzwiecki for absorbing vibration and thus providing a reliable electrical connection.

Art Unit: 2833

Providing a board at each end of the ribbon cable is just a mere duplication design. It has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T. T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2011. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Bradley can be reached on 571-272-2800 extension 33. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. T. Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2833

